

Westlaw.

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d

Page 1

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2003 WL 1905636 (D.Del.)  
(Cite as: Not Reported in F.Supp.2d)

**H**

Briefs and Other Related Documents

Arthrocare Corp. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.D.Del.,2003.Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court,D. Delaware.  
ARTHROCARE CORPORATION, Plaintiff,  
v.  
SMITH & NEPHEW, INC., Defendant.  
No. Civ.A. 01-504-SLR.

April 14, 2003.

MEMORANDUM ORDER

ROBINSON, J.

\*1 At Wilmington this 14th day of April, 2003, having reviewed the parties' motions in limine;

IT IS ORDERED that:

1) Arthrocare's motion in limine to try inequitable conduct to the court and to preclude Smith & Nephew from raising issues of inequitable conduct before the jury (D.I.322) is granted. The parties shall reserve part of their allocated time to try the inequitable conduct defense to the court, either at the end of each trial day or at the end of the jury trial.

2) Arthrocare's motion in limine to exclude the testimony of Smith & Nephew's patent law expert Ronald L. Panitch (D.I.316) is granted.

3) Arthrocare's motion in limine to preclude Smith & Nephew from referring to Arthrocare's withdrawal of certain claims (D.I.320) is granted.

4) Arthrocare's motion in limine to preclude Smith & Nephew from relying on any undisclosed facts or defenses (D.I.317) is granted. To be tried, issues must have been adequately identified in a pleading or in motion papers.

5) Arthrocare's motion in limine to preclude Smith & Nephew from referring to Judge Orrick's December 1, 1998 interlocutory decision in the Ethicon case (D.I.321) is granted.

6) Arthrocare's motion in limine that Smith & Nephew's indefiniteness defenses not be presented to the jury (D.I.323) is denied.

7) Arthrocare's motion in limine to preclude Smith & Nephew from referring to its antitrust counterclaim or allegedly harmful effects of Arthrocare's RF devices (D.I.324) is conditionally granted, so long as Arthrocare does not introduce evidence regarding the Ethicon license and industry acclaim for its RF devices.

8) Arthrocare's motion in limine to preclude Smith & Nephew from referring to a purported control RF settlement agreement (D.I.319) is granted as unopposed.

9) Arthrocare's motion to strike the Roos declaration (D.I.274) is granted.

10) Arthrocare's unopposed motion in limine to preclude Smith & Nephew from referring to injunctive relief that may be sought as a result of a finding of infringement (D.I.318) is granted as unopposed.

11) Smith & Nephew's motion in limine 1 of 6 to exclude certain Arthrocare expert testimony (D.I.325) is granted to the extent it relates to claim construction and the fact that experts are limited by their reports.

12) Smith & Nephew's motion in limine 2 of 6 to exclude certain evidence related to Arthrocare's products (D.I.326) is denied as evidence of copying and of commercial success is relevant to obviousness.

13) Smith & Nephew's motion in limine 3 of 6 to

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d

Page 2

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2003 WL 1905636 (D.Del.)  
(Cite as: Not Reported in F.Supp.2d)

exclude evidence of the reexamination of the '536 patent (D.I.327) is denied.

14) Smith & Nephew's motion in limine 4 of 6 to exclude certain evidence related to licensing (D.I.328) is granted.<sup>FN1</sup>

FN1. Smith & Nephew's motion to compel in this regard (D.I.198) is denied.

15) Smith & Nephew's motion in limine 5 of 6 to exclude certain Smith & Nephew documents (D.I.329) is granted to the extent it relates to the parties' 510(k) FDA filings and inadvertently produced privileged documents. The motion is denied as it relates to Smith & Nephew's marketing documents.

\*2 16) Smith & Nephew's motion in limine 6 of 6 to exclude evidence related to the control RF product (D.I.330) is denied.

17) Smith & Nephew's motion to strike the expert reports of Creighton G. Hoffman and Elliott H. Leitman (D.I.272) is denied.

D.Del.,2003.  
Arthrocare Corp. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.  
Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2003 WL 1905636 (D.Del.)

Briefs and Other Related Documents (Back to top)

- 2003 WL 22331340 (Trial Pleading) Preliminary Jury Instructions (May. 13, 2003)
- 2003 WL 22331339 (Trial Pleading) Charge to the Jury (May. 12, 2003)
- 2003 WL 22331341 (Trial Pleading) Joint Proposed Jury Instructions (May. 06, 2003)
- 2003 WL 24282961 () (Report or Affidavit of Brian J. Skromme, Ph.D.) (May 4, 2003)
- 2003 WL 24290854 () Deposition of Ronald L Panitch (Mar. 28, 2003) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- 2003 WL 24290853 () (Partial Testimony) (Mar. 20, 2003)
- 2003 WL 24282962 () Rule 26(a)(2)(B) Expert Report (Feb. 17, 2003) Original Image of this

Document (PDF)

- 2001 WL 34889109 () Supplemental Expert Report of Ronald L. Panitch, Esq. Pursuant to Fed. R. CIV. Pro. 26(c) (Jul. 25, 2001) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- 1:01CV00504 (Docket) (Jul. 25, 2001)

END OF DOCUMENT